DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 567 CS 509 710

AUTHOR Cyphert, Dale
TITLE Public Speaking in a Second Language: An Investigation of Student Apprehensions.
PUB DATE 1997-11-00
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (83rd, Chicago, IL, November 19-23, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Apprehension; Curriculum Research; *English (Second Language); *Foreign Students; Higher Education; *Public Speaking; Questionnaires; *Student Needs; Teacher Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Nonnative Speakers; Reticence.

ABSTRACT

A study examined the appropriateness of a university reticence program for students who speak English as a Second Language (ESL). An analysis of enrollment indicated that ESL students were enrolling in the reticence program in proportions that exceeded their own enrollment in the university and that ESL students were more likely than native speakers to enroll in the reticence option. A questionnaire was distributed to 50 faculty and teaching assistants who were responsible for one or more sections of the basic speech course. These surveys and interviews were used to gain insight into the appropriateness of either regular public speaking classes or the reticence program to address ESL students' speech skills and apprehension needs. The study concluded that while the current self-selection of students into reticence sections is not an appropriate choice from the available options, neither course addresses the specific skill or apprehension issues of second language public speaking. (Contains 27 references and 6 notes). (Author/NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 415 567

Public Speaking In a Second Language: An Investigation of Student Apprehensions

Dale Cyphert
The University of Northern Iowa
Doctoral Candidate, The Pennsylvania State University

presented to
The Communication Apprehension and Avoidance Commission
Speech Communication Association Annual Convention
November, 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Cyphert
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Dale Cyphert, M.A.
Coordinator, Business Communication Program
College of Business Administration
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0125
home: (319) 266-6743
office: (319) 273-6150
email: dale cyphert@uni edu

CS509710

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public Speaking In a Second Language: An Investigation of Student Apprehensions

This study examines the appropriateness of a university reticence program for students who speak English as a Second Language. An analysis of enrollment indicated that ESL students were enrolling in the reticence program in proportions that exceeded their own enrollment in the university and that ESL students were more likely than native speakers to enroll in the reticence option. Surveys and interviews were used to gain insight into the appropriateness of either regular public speaking classes or the reticence program to address ESL students' speech skill and apprehension needs. The study concludes that while the current self-selection of students into reticence sections is not an inappropriate choice from the available options, neither course addresses the specific skill or apprehension issues of second language public speaking.

Public Speaking In a Second Language: An Investigation of Student Apprehensions

Public Speaking in a Second Language

Over the past fifty years, cross-cultural communication has become a major area of research but surprisingly little attention has been given to the specifics of public speaking in cross-cultural or second-language situations. As the world's economies become more interrelated, however, any personal, professional and social advantages that accrue from skill in public speaking begin to cross cultural and linguistic boundaries. More than 5,000 foreign companies are currently doing business in the United States. Over 8,000 U. S. firms employ 2.5 million American citizens abroad (Lucas, 20). Individuals in most nations will increasingly need public speaking skills that are appropriate for audiences who do not share their own cultural and linguistic background.

One aspect of the growing global economy is the increasing number of international students in American colleges and universities. A 1986 survey found most of these students were not required to take a communication course as undergraduates, but if they did it was most likely to be the general public speaking course offered for native speakers of English (Hesler).

ESL Speakers in the Reticence Program

This study undertakes research on the question of second-language public speaking instruction within the context of a large mid-Atlantic university setting. International students are a small proportion of the student body: in the fall of 1996, only 115 foreign students were accepted of approximately 800 applicants, representing about 2% of the incoming class. The campus draws from several large urban areas with immigrant populations, however, so students who are U. S. residents but speak English as a second language presumably constitute a somewhat larger proportion of the student body. Students who list themselves as non-native speakers of

English (ESL) are required to submit TOFEL scores of at least 550 for admission, but no tabulation is currently being made with respect to the numbers or ultimate fate of these students. Nor is there any way to determine whether applicants have listed English as their native language in order to avoid the TOFEL requirement. Majors are available in five foreign languages[1] and several international business options are offered in the school of business administration, but these programs combined claim only a few hundred undergraduate majors and the university does not claim any particular distinction in these areas.[2]

The unique structure of the basic public speaking course at this university has made second language public speaking instruction an issue, however, and also affords a rare opportunity to investigate various instructional formats and methodologies for teaching speech in a second language context. The university requires all students to take a freshman level public speaking course, the assumption is that all incoming students will be sufficiently fluent in English and culturally competent with respect to the prerequisite communication skills that are involved in public discourse. The course, Speech Communication 100, (hereafter referred to as "100") is offered in four versions. There is presently no institutional guidance provided for ESL students with respect to which course they should take, although individual counselors will sometimes suggest one version over others, usually for career reasons. Nor are any of the course variations designed specifically for the instruction of ESL students.

100A is a typical freshman level public speaking emphasis, with three speech assignments, one group discussion assignment, and one written speech evaluation assignment. By University

---

[1] French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish, with graduate programs in French, German and Spanish. Additional courses are offered in Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew. Japanese, Korean, Polish, Portuguese, Slavik languages, and Swahili.

[2] The University's strength in engineering and scientific graduate programs attracts a large number of foreign students, however, and the department of speech communication offers several sections of non-credit ESL speaking and writing, including a two semester series designed specifically to develop the instructional speaking skills of international teaching assistants.

policy, 60% of the grade must be based on oral performance. The University currently uses one text for all sections, Stephen Lucas' *The Art of Public Speaking*, 5th ed., for which a supplement for has recently been provided, *Public speaking for Non-Native Speakers*, by Karen Johnson and Paula Golombek. ***100B*** is public speaking with a group performance emphasis. Students are required to give one individual speech and to participate in a symposium, a forum and a group discussion, as with 100A, performance must constitute 60% of the grade. Enrollment in this course is typically a third that of 100A, and is often suggested for students who plan business or human resources careers. ***100C*** focuses on the critical consumption of public discourse with an emphasis on speech analysis rather than on speech production. Generally only two sections of this option are offered each semester, constituting less than 3% of the total enrollment. ***100D*** is designed to assist students who have high levels of communication apprehension across a variety of communication situations. Students are informed of this option only after enrolling in 100A, B, or C. Everyone is given a brief description sheet of the course, a checklist of possible areas of communication apprehension, and instructions for applying for admission. Interested students are interviewed by the 100D instructors and placed in one of three sections offered each semester. Most of the course focuses on conversational communication skills, and students are required to perform only one formal speech to the entire class.

Over the last several years, ESL student enrollment in the 100D section has increased [3]. The program director has encountered an increasing number of students who have learned about the course prior to the interview sessions without ever enrolling in one of the other options. While

---

[3] Hoffman made an estimate of ESL students enrolled in this option by counting the number of non-Anglo/Germanic surnames on course rosters from 1981 through 1993 and noted a steady increase (9). Obviously this method both underestimates ESL students with Anglo/Germanic names and overestimates the number of native speakers with Asian, Hispanic or African sounding names, but such a method can be expected to reflect *changes* in the proportion regardless of any inaccuracies in the actual count.

no formal application or admission records are kept, the director reports that a large number of these students speak English as a second language and have heard about the course from friends. The director presently counsels these students that the course is *not* designed to help them with English language skills, and that the course is probably appropriate only if they displayed reticence behaviors in their native language as well. Nevertheless, the proportion of ESL students in the 100D sections far exceeds that in 100A.[4]

While it is obvious that ESL students are self-selecting into the reticence option, it is not clear that this is the optimal instructional method for teaching second-language public speaking skills, nor was the course designed for that purpose. Casual conversation with the TA's who teach the 100A option suggests that there is a widespread sense of inadequacy with respect to public speaking instruction for ESL students. Sometimes the source of the problem is seen as insufficient time, resources or expertise for instruction of these students. Other TA's view the issue as a lack of adequate student preparation, specifically English language competence, for success in the course and some actively encourage students whose English competence is low to transfer to the 100D sections, where they perceive these students will have a better chance to earn a good grade in the course. A third perspective questions the appropriateness of teaching U. S. speech models to international and bilingual students without regard to the appropriateness of the model for their future public speaking activities.

Meanwhile, instructors in 100D are seeing an increasing number of ESL students, some of whom experience reticence only with respect to communication in English. While the course includes specific information regarding social norms and verbal and non-verbal conversational cues, often helpful for such students, it is not clear whether intensive practice in either English

---

[4] Hoffman estimated the proportion to be approximately 25%, which would amount to nearly 10 times the enrollment of international students at the University. A preliminary survey completed for this project found a 30% ESL enrollment but looked at only one semester.

conversation or formal presentation would be equally, or more, effective. Nor is it clear what effect the inclusion of socially assertive ESL students has on the interpersonal dynamics of the reticence sections. An important aspect of the course is the creation of a supportive group where students know they share an apprehensive attitude with regard to communication in general, yet the ESL students can occasionally be observed in comfortable social conversation in their native language. Finally, the 100D course does not conform to pedagogical models developed outside the U. S. or with target languages other than English, which include curricula on U. S. speech genre and rhetorical patterns.

Pedagogical Models for Instruction in Second Language Public Speaking

Several recent public speaking texts have incorporated a multicultural perspective by including discussions of culture and language, but have generally avoided any discussion of public speaking skills that might be unique to second-language situations. Self and Carlson-Liu, for example, note that speaker and audience "thought patterns" are likely to be different when they speak different native languages, but their text focuses on the responsibility of the *audience* to "counter these almost instinctively negative responses to unfamiliar language sounds and content" (38). Native and second-language speakers alike are urged to "use acceptable grammar . . . avoid careless use of slang and idioms . . . strive for clear and accurate pronunciation . . . accurate and vivid vocabulary, and adapt language choices appropriately for each situation, audience and setting" (40-41) without any hint that cross-language speakers face any unique responsibilities. Additional information is provided with respect to cultural differences in non-verbal aspects of communication, but interpersonal and problem solving examples are used without any reference to possible applications in public speaking situations. Speakers are merely urged to develop "flexibility" in "code switching" in order to facilitate their cross-cultural speaking skill (42). Similarly, Kearney and Plax's recent text offers a comprehensive treatment of variations in speech

organization, communication styles and cultural practices, but performance advice is limited. These authors place the responsibility for accommodation clearly with the speaker, who is urged to "familiarize yourself with and use your audience's language codes" (171) and avoid jargon, unfamiliar examples and offensive words and phrases. The text is specifically addressed to members of U. S. co-cultures (viii), however, and there is no instruction with respect to the specifics of learning to accomplishing the code-switching task, however. No advice is provided for the speaker who is not already a sophisticated bilingual.

Language teachers have long used public speaking activities as a means of specific language instruction. Often the purpose is simply to create classroom situations that encourage oral practice (e.g. English, Frazer, Henderson, Stokes), but others have noted the unique advantages of formal public speaking instruction. Lore-Lawson uses public speaking to build self-esteem and confidence in the target language. Smallwood points out that "public" presentation involves "a synthesis of numerous skills" and students must add the intangibles of poise, confidence and organized self-expression to their "ability in pronunciation, intonation, competence and vocabulary control" (44). Furthermore, as language instruction becomes more important for international business success, some programs have recognized the need for specific instruction in public speaking in the second language. English language majors at Taiwan's Tsing Hua University, for example, must take two semesters of public speaking. More fluent language skill is one goal, but a higher priority is to teach "students how to organize material according to American rhetorical patterns" (Katchen 3). Similarly, students at Hungary's Semmelweiss Medical University learn English not simply to "express thoughts in English," but because they need to "take part in professional discussions, arguments or even debates in English"(3). An American corollary might be Susquehanna University where foreign language programs include a business course that covers language-specific public speaking skills (Johnson).

While beginning language courses use informal talks and oral reports as ways to build oral proficiency and confidence, professionally oriented programs place an emphasis on the specifics of formal public speaking techniques. Susquehanna University, for example, adapts a Toastmaster's format for use in language-specific speech courses because the traditional language class's oral report focuses on "content, rather than on method of presentation." Instead, the course attempts to familiarize students with the conventions of introductions, networking, and appropriate business speaking (Johnson 98). Similarly, Semmelweiss' students are taught the conventions of international academic argument (Rudnai & Ferenczy 3-4). Tsing Hua University's curriculum is particularly sensitive to the large differences in Chinese and Western rhetorical patterns and offers students methodical instruction and practice in conventional speech organizations that are suitable for English language speeches in the United States (Katchen 4).

U. S. programs that concentrate on English as the target language have usually been developed in response to the needs of international students, and tend to take a remedial approach toward developing socially acceptable language use. Vanderbilt University, for example, offers a non-credit course for graduate students, faculty and staff with the goals of improving the intelligibility, fluency and accuracy of their English pronunciation (Graham 3). Womack and Bernstein describe the speech course for foreign students at Pepperdine University, which focuses on English pronunciation and syntax in the "practical application of conversation, small group, nonverbal, and public presentational situations" (vi), and is a mandatory class for student who cannot demonstrate adequate scores on an English language exam. Churchman proposes that international students be offered a hybrid communication course as a substitute for the standard public address course. In her view, this affords instruction in group, interpersonal and non-verbal communication, which she sees as fundamental to eventual success in public speaking. Similarly, Indiana State University changed a course for international students from a public speaking to an interpersonal concentration because so many international students "appeared to demonstrate the

behaviors of the communication apprehensive" (Hesler 2). The conventions of public and interpersonal communication are presumed to be quite different, and warrant different instructional methods in most U. S. speech programs, yet are often combined or collapsed without comment in a second-language adaptation. Specialized texts are available for this type of course, which emphasize English pronunciation (Johnson & Golumbek, Womack & Bernstein) and culturally sensitive classroom techniques (Johnson & Golombek), although the complexity of cross-cultural public speaking is not necessarily addressed. Womack & Bernstein, for example, introduce public speaking with the history of the Greco-European tradition and the Ciceronian canon. They seem not to notice the irony of their approach and make no mention of any special requirements for the cross-cultural or second-language speaker beyond special attention to the correct pronunciation of American English.

Lucas' text provides only cursory advice to avoid ethnocentrisim and unintended obscene gestures (20-23), although Johnson and Golombeck's recent supplement provides instructors with activities designed to assist non-native speakers of English. Instructors are urged to consider a student's overall "comprehensibility" rather than adherence to standard English pronunciation, intonation and rhythm, and to respect cultural differences in communicative styles and rhetorical strategies. Johnson and Golombeck's emphasis is on supportive instructional methods, but several activities highlight issues that could affect the success of a second language speaker, at least in the context of a public speaking course: the cultural conventions that govern topic selection, expected speech structure and content, sources and use of evidence, audience analysis and adaptation, and persuasive strategies. These authors also suggest specific instruction in the conventional English phrases used to construct arguments and persuasive messages, speech transitions, as well as coaching in English pronunciation, grammar and non-verbal behaviors.

The radically different pedagogical orientations of second language public speaking programs suggest wide differences in purpose, a variety of potentially appropriate instructional

methods and large differences in the research questions surrounding second-language speech pedagogy. Hessler, for example, observed students who exhibited communication apprehension and "did not know how to interrupt or participate in a class discussion" or "publicly state an opinion" (3) and concluded that they were in need of instruction to overcome these difficulties. She summarizes the continuing research questions as 1) whether international student needs are best met in segregated or mixed courses, and 2) whether they should be offered instruction in interpersonal or public speaking skills. Contrast this to Tsing Hua University's presumption that students are rhetorically competent, but in need of systematic instruction in another culture's public speaking conventions. Tsing Hua's Katchen complains that American speech texts make too many cultural assumptions and are thus "unsuitable" for second-language speech instruction (2). She sees a need for additional research on the specific rhetorical strategies used by American speakers and a corresponding improvement in pedagogical methods that do not assume students are already conversant with them.

The experiences of individuals who have taken public speaking courses in a second language suggest several additional questions. First, the attribution of speech apprehension to the use of the second language itself is not uncommon. Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope define foreign language apprehension as a unique anxiety syndrome, similar to but not necessarily concomitant with a general communication apprehension. The lack of communicative control and constant monitoring of communication while speaking a second language are cited as situational factors that increase foreign language apprehension (127). Churchman notes that test anxiety, and by association speech anxiety, is a reasonable response for some international students, whose performance reflects on family, determines their ability to remain in the United States, and might form the basis for career success in a home country (5). Furthermore, the dynamics of 'clustering' among international students to create a social support system further increases their language

apprehension because they alienate themselves from the American students who form their classroom audiences (4).

Speakers of a second language commonly perceive language itself as the primary communication barrier in a formal speech situation. Some research supports this expectation (Milan, 1993) while Hines and Barraclough suggest it might be less threatening to a student's positive self-image to attribute their communication difficulties to their own lack of motivation or general ability than to language that is not as fluent as it "should" be (246). The perception of non-standard language as a "difficulty" is further heightened in the United States where it has been demonstrated that accent alone causes Anglo listeners to assess speakers more negatively (Powell & Avila, DeFreitas).

Finally, the experience of students suggests that the quality of instruction in second language public speaking is a major factor in their success. Reports of significant damage done in speech classes that attempt to "discipline language" instead of teaching linguistic survival skills (Cantu 7) stand in stark contrast to the success that cultural adaptations, explicit instruction, and oral practice can achieve (Churchman 3, Katchen 4).

Clearly, a general awareness of cross-cultural communication and the diversity of global audiences does not address some complex questions about public speaking in a second language setting. Nor is a general admonition to "be sensitive" to cultural differences, or "learn to use the codes" of the audience sufficient instruction for the student who is trying to *learn* the cultural expectations and linguistic codes of an unfamiliar audience. Furthermore, the teaching of public speaking in a second language could be done for a variety of purposes and any evaluation of instructional success must necessarily be made with an understanding of a program's specific educational goals.

The Reticence Program as Appropriate Remediation

Recognizing that the various models of second language speech instruction are designed with widely different purposes, the first goal of this project was to investigate the appropriateness of the current instructional format for undergraduate students at this University. The long term objective of this line of investigation is to improve the quality of public speaking instruction at this university, especially for those students whose civic or professional future can be expected to include the presentation of formal public speeches in a non-native language. Because this constitutes only the first, exploratory stage of a new line of research, two general open-ended questions were formed:

Research Question # 1: Are ESL students appropriately enrolling in 100D?

Research Question # 2: Does 100D or 100A provide better public speaking instruction for ESL students.

Methodology

A questionnaire was distributed to all teaching assistants who were responsible for one or more sections of the basic speech course. This included 41 faculty and teaching assistants who taught 75 sections of the 100A option, seven TA's responsible for 13 sections of the 100B option, one TA who was teaching both sections of the 100C option, and one faculty and one TA who were handling two sections of the 100D option.[5] Instructors who were willing to participate further were asked to distribute a second questionnaire to any students who self-identified as speaking or learning a second language. This questionnaire was designed to identify both students who spoke English as a second language and native English speakers who anticipated making speeches in a second language and to identify their career goals, language learning background and proficiency.

[5] A third section of SpCom 100D and a section of 100B were being taught by the researcher. In order to avoid any conflict of interest regarding their own performance in the course, students in those sections were not invited to be part of the subject pool.

Six ESL students were then engaged in follow-up interviews regarding their experiences in an English language public speaking instruction at this University. The interviews were conducted from an open-ended question guides and additional insights, opinions or anecdotes were welcomed by the researcher. The purpose of this project was to gain an overview of the perceptions of second-language speech instruction, and no attempt was made to collect systematic data on either second-language speech students or current instructional methods at the University.

Results

Eighteen instructors (35%) returned surveys. Instructors in 24 100A sections identified a total of 12 students (1.8%) as ESL. An estimated 4 (4.2%) ESL students were enrolled in 3 sections of 100B students and none in the two sections of 100C. In contrast, the three sections of 100D include a total of 20 (30%) students for whom English is a second language. While these sample sizes are small, the results support the anecdotal reports of the Option D coordinator that ESL enrollment tends to be disproportionately large in that option. Of the ESL students in the sample, 55.5% of them had enrolled in 100D. Overall, the option is selected by only 2% of the University's undergraduates.

Based on willingness to participate in the research and estimates of the numbers of potential subjects in their classrooms, fourteen instructors were provided with 65 student questionnaires for in-class distribution. A total of 40 questionnaires were returned, 22 of which were from native English speakers who had learned a second language, six of whom also spoke a third language. Of the remaining 18 respondents, four listed Korean as their first language, four named Spanish, two each listed Japanese and Cantonese, and Sindhi, Turkish, Punjabi, Mandarin, Malay were each listed by one student. One respondent listed Chinese as a first language without specifying the dialect and eight of these ESL students were at least trilingual.

Learning Goals of Native English speakers

More than half (12) of the students who had learned a second language had specific career goals that included public presentations in a language other than English, most (7) involving international business, diplomacy or military careers and the rest planning to teach the language, work as a translator or in one case, perform bilingual speech pathology. Another 5 respondents indicated that public speaking might be a possible career activity. The careers mentioned, public relations, scientific research, child psychology and advertising, would be likely to involve public speaking in the United States, but these students did not specifically plan to use their second language. Five students, (23%) did not expect to use their second language for any career purposes.

Second Language Public Speaking Experience Among Native English Speakers

Half of the respondents had given reports, speeches or taken oral exams in their language classes and indicated that this was their only public speaking experience in the second language. Eight students had not had even classroom experiences in formal speaking. Only one student, who had lived in Germany for a year, reported public speaking experience outside the second-language classroom.

Second Language Proficiency Among Native English Speakers.

Only two students rated themselves fluent in the second language, one of whom had lived in Germany and one who was ethnically bicultural. Five others felt they had better than average language skills. Ten reported communicative ability without fluency and five felt their language skill was "poor" or " rusty."

Language Learning History of Non-native English speakers.

Many students had learned English from multiple sources, and the totals here thus exceed the actual number of respondents. Seven (39%) had learned English in the home, half had learned at least some English during informal work, school or social situations. Ten students (56%) had

taken English as a Foreign Language and half had taken formal English as a Second Language coursework.

English Language Proficiency among Non-native Speakers

Respondents to this survey indicated a wide range of English proficiency. Seven students were fluently bilingual, three reporting that their English was better than their first language. All these students had learned English between the ages of two and five. Three respondents rated their English as "good" or "pretty good;" all three had taken high-school level EFL courses, although one reported family use of English as well. Five students (28%) rated their English somewhat negatively, calling it "fair" or "moderate" or commenting on specific difficulties; one had learned first learned English in first grade, the rest during the high school years. One student, who learned English at the age of 24, rated his ability as "very poor" and two did not answer the item.

Two students who rated their English as excellent were interviewed; both spoke fluent English with an American accent. Three students who rated their ability more moderately were interviewed. Two were fluent in conversation, speaking with moderate Korean and Malay accents. The third, a Japanese exchange student, was less fluent but competent in conversation. One student who did not answer the item was interviewed. She also spoke fluent, moderately accented English in conversation.

Public Speaking in English for the non-Native Speaker

Six students were available for interviews, which were conducted in the researcher's campus office. Three were enrolled in the 100A option, and three in the 100D. Two of the 100A students had learned English as children, one at home and one in school, and spoke with American accents. The third was the Japanese exchange student noted previously. Two of the 100D students had learned English when they immigrated to the United States. The third had learned English as a child in Malaysia.

Brief descriptions are provided of each student's perceptions of their public speaking experience. Because these were open-ended interviews of a very small sample, it is not appropriate to claim they offer a complete picture of students at the University. On the other hand, their subjective comments offer insight into the wide variety of perceptions ESL students can have of their public speaking instructional needs.

Jin, a Korean-American, speaks fluent English and does not consider public speaking in his second language to present any special difficulty. He did not report any feelings of stagefright in either language, and does not consider himself to be shy. Jin reported confidence, eye-contact and a direct, extemporaneous speaking style to be the most important factors in good public speaking. He feels these were the elements most strongly emphasized in the 100A section he was taking, and he also feels these would be the same factors a Korean audience would look for in a Korean speaker. Jin is satisfied with his public speaking instruction and feels he is learning "a lot of techniques and rules" that are useful for him.

Mina was also born in the United States and speaks fluent English and Sindhi, as well as some Hindi and Spanish. She does not feel language presents any difficulty in her 100A speech class, although she does experience stagefright when she performs in plays. Mina feels that the format of the speech, body language and speech content are the most important elements of public speaking success. A really good speaker is one who catches your attention. Having spent some time in India, Mina was able to comment on the differences between speeches in English and Sindhi, which she described as "passionate" and "excessively loud." She felt her public speaking class was preparing her well, although she recognized that speaking would be "different" outside the classroom.

Yuko is a Japanese exchange student who feels her communication skills in English are adequate "in everyday life," but is concerned that her pronunciation prevents American audiences from understanding her. Whereas conversation partners can stop her to ask questions and she can use gestures to clarify her meaning, this is less possible in a speech. In her classroom experience, audiences will ask questions after the speech, but when they stop her to ask for clarification during a speech, she becomes "nervous." Yuko reports stagefright in both English and Japanese language speech situations, although she claimed she was "not nervous" during her second speech class assignment. Yuko described a good speaker as one who got the audience's attention, selected topics of interest to the audience, and presented a well-organized speech. These were the skills she felt had been most emphasized in her speech class, and she thinks these would also be important in Japan. She found the instruction not to memorize a speech to be the most difficult to follow, since she found it difficult to "make grammar in my head" during the stressful speech situation. Her solution was to memorize the grammatical constructions as she practiced the speech, but taking care to chose slightly different vocabulary each time she said a sentence. Yuko's perceptions of her American classmates was that they were "very good" at speaking because in this culture "everything is free speech" and they had thus had much practice in speaking. She found this to be very motivating and felt her classmates offered excellent advice as well as a supportive atmosphere. They didn't laugh at her, and instead "tried to listen" to her, assisting her in overcoming any language difficulties during her speeches.

Khatijah is a Malaysian immigrant who speaks what she considers to be "average" English as well as Malay and some Arabic. She enrolled in the 100D option because she suffered from stagefright, which had also prevented her from presenting the speeches she had written for a debating team in Malaysia. Khatijah was particularly concerned about making speeches to Americans, however, since she felt she would make grammar errors and "here you have to be correct to be understood." She also understood that the 100D option would require more writing than speaking and she considered her written English to be better than her spoken. Khatijah felt she had learned organization and style in her English 202 course, and the main lesson from her speech class was the importance of preparation to overcome stagefright.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Her perception is that a Malaysian speaker would take greater care to begin a speech with appropriate compliments to the audience, but would otherwise be judged according to the same standards as an American speech.

Bong Rok is a Korean immigrant who speaks excellent English but avoids speaking to Americans. Most of friends are Korean and he is an officer in the campus's Korean student organization where he has presented speeches in mixed English and Korean. Stagefright is "kind of" a problem, but only in English. He also reports being shy only in English. This student feels that confidence is his largest barrier to good public speaking and that fluency with the language is the most important skill he will need for success. The speaking skill which he found most important from his 100D speech class was the development of speech "content." He felt he knew that speeches needed to have introductions and conclusions, but previous to the class he did not know what to put in between. Bong Rok's expectation is that speaking in a second language "will always be harder" but he is satisfied that he has gained from his public speaking course. He selected this option because it would be "easier" due to its limited amount of speech presentation. Even though he does not gain extensive speech experience in the class, it is "better than nothing" and more training than he had before.

Jing is from Taiwan and began learning English in high school. The 100D option was recommended by her advisor as a way to improve her English skills, which concern her somewhat. She feels her English hampers her ability to give speeches, since the stress on pronunciation and grammar makes her nervous. She does not have "much" stagefright and even less in her native Mandarin. Jing did report being shy in social situations, however, both here and in her native country. The reticence course emphasized social conversation and class participation, which Jing found to be appropriate for her needs. She does not plan a career which will include significant public speaking. The instructor of the course corrected Jing's pronunciation during speech rehearsals, which she found to be helpful, but no other specific second language instruction was provided in the course. Jing judged a "good" speaker to be organized, one who chooses interesting material, and includes some humor. She or he must also be clear and speak with sufficient volume. Jing noted that Chinese speakers are "more serious" and she thus preferred the American speaking style.

These six students constitute a small sample size for generalizable results, but their experience allows some programmatic assessment, and points to several aspects of public speaking in a second language that seem to warrant additional investigation.

Are ESL students appropriately enrolling in 100D?

These interviews suggest that ESL students are selecting the 100D option based on general communication apprehension. Although it is clear that their apprehension is related, at least in part, to the use of English, that apprehension is not confined to public speaking situations. The general cause of communication apprehension varies, but reflects a person's learned response of anxiety to communication situations and the consistent attribution of difficulties to their own anxiety (Kelly & Watson 62). In the case of ESL students, it seems clear that language proficiency

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is not the primary motivation for enrolling in 100D. Instead, their apprehension follows the pattern for students generally accepted into the program and is more closely related to self-attributions of communication incompetence than to any objectively validated assessment of English language skill.

Two factors, in particular, were apparent from the interviews. First, apprehension results when language competence is self-perceived as less than *should be expected*, but expectations of language proficiency were not defined with respect to any objective standards of English fluency. None of the students interviewed seemed to use any kind of objective criteria to judge their own English proficiency. They relied instead on the fact that they had taken classes and thereby assumed that they should know more than they did. Similarly, one Turkish woman who was not available for an interview, had not begun learning English until coming with her husband to the United States at the age of 24. She described her competence as "very poor for three years practice," yet she was successfully completing a university level public speaking course and judged by her instructor to be quite fluent.

The tendency for apprehensive communicators to unreasonably blame themselves for their difficulties with communication is addressed by the 100D curriculum, which teaches students to make more accurate assessments of the components of success in various communication events. Additionally, the course provides instruction and practice in the use of verbal and non-verbal feedback to accurately gauge the reactions of others, as well as practice in articulating communication goals in terms of specific behaviors (e.g. "I wish to give my advisor my reasons for changing my major") rather than feelings (e.g. "I want to talk to my advisor without being embarrassed by my language"). Both techniques would seem to be appropriate for ESL students whose assessment of their own communication skill is somewhat unrelated to their actually ability to speak comprehensible English.

Second, the student's social position as either a peer or subaltern speaker of English seems to affect their apprehension levels. The Japanese exchange student, who had lesser English skills, reported fewer problems than more fluent immigrant students. Furthermore, this international student seemed to anticipate a reciprocal accommodation on the part of her audience and did not accept the entire responsibility for speaking "perfect" English in order to be understood.[6] She found an American audience to be "very motivating" for her, because they could offer advice and assistance. In contrast, the immigrant students all voiced a concern that their grammar or pronunciation was unacceptable for an American audience. Two students, in fact, had successfully given speeches in English to Korean and Malay audiences and reported less apprehension with those audiences of non-native speakers. ESL students are not directed to the 100D option as a remediation step, but those who take the course do express concern that perfect English is required for successful communication with Americans.

Does 100D or 100A Provide Better Public Speaking Instruction for ESL Students?

Given the level of communication apprehension experienced by the ESL students who are enrolling in the 100D option, it might seem to be obvious that they are best served by that course. On the other hand, if their apprehension is due to misconceptions about their ability to speak successfully to native speakers of English, there seems to be some warrant for directing these students toward the more speech intensive 100A option.

The reality is, however, that none of these students reported any language-specific instruction in either option. Yuko, the Japanese exchange student, reported that her fellow students offered "lots of advice" after class and Jing's 100D instructor had provided corrections of her pronunciation during a speech rehearsal, but cross-cultural or second language speech had never been covered by the instructors. This is not to say, of course, that no 100A instructors provide any

---

[6] Other research suggests Japanese place more responsibility on a listener in interpersonal exchange so there may be cultural differences as well.

instruction, but it is not part of the department's core curriculum and is not covered by the current textbook.

One incident that occurred during the investigation might shed some light on the lack of direct instruction. One TA, when asked to estimate the number of ESL students asked, "how do I tell?" I told him the initial questionnaire was merely to get a count of students who might be facing language issues and he could just go by whether they spoke accented English. This was easy for him to do, but he commented "oh, just the stereotypical approach" Like ethnicity, linguistic difference seemed to represent something that should be ignored in order to treat people "equally". If language differences are not spoken of in polite company, it is probably not surprising that the subaltern ESL speaker also internalizes the need to speak perfect English before credibility can be established. Perhaps more importantly, this T. A.'s attitude would seem to preclude the sort of direct instruction in language-related credibility and comprehension techniques that would most help an ESL student in the 100A option. Again, it is not possible to say that all speech instructors are equally unwilling to discuss language as a factor in speech delivery, but any assumption that ESL students enrolled in 100A will necessarily receive appropriate instruction for their unique needs appears to be unwarranted.

An additional caution might also be noted, based on the high proportion of ESL students who do identify themselves as apprehensive. Language-specific speech instruction can be useful, or it can be damaging. Corrective feedback can be "cruel and humiliating" (Cantu 6) or "encouraging" and "motivating" (Yuko). Cantu describes her college speech class as a place where "my language inhibitions became even greater. Instead of reassuring, or fostering my public speaking, which the class was ostensibly supposed to do, I was so humiliated and felt like such a failure that it took years to get over the trauma" (6). This is, unfortunately, true of some of the communication apprehension reported by native speakers as well, who often trace their difficulties

to traumatic speech education experiences. It might be that ignoring language in public speaking instruction at least avoids the most egregious abuses of ESL students.

This is not to say, however, that the 100D option necessarily provides the best instruction for these students. Apprehension about speaking to a native-speaking audience was a consistent concern among the interviewees, but the emphasis on social skills in 100D does not allow time for extensive practice in public speaking. Similarly, credibility-building techniques are contextualized as part of the instruction in social and classroom conversation, but their applicability to language or to public speaking in a second language was missed by these students. While the course does appear to be successful with regard to alleviating social and classroom apprehension, these ESL students reported only a limited sense of confidence with regard to public speaking. As Bong Rok put it, before taking the class he "had no idea" what to do, and whatever he learned was "better than nothing," but this hardly constitutes ideal instruction.

Further Research Implications

While students appear to be appropriately using language apprehension to self-select into 100D sections, neither version of the public speaking course could be said to offer speech instruction that is geared specifically for the unique needs of ESL students. Furthermore, the native English speakers who anticipate making speeches in a second language are offered no instruction specific to that end. This raises a series of questions for further research:

- Does specific second-language speech instruction improve public speaking ability of ESL students?
- Does specific second-language speech instruction reduce general communication apprehension for ESL students in a reticence program?
- Does specific second-language speech instruction reduce language apprehension for ESL students in a reticence program?

- Does instruction in apprehension-reducing techniques address language apprehension similarly to general communication apprehension?
- Does immigrant status affect self-perceived language-use expectations in ESL students?
- Does immigrant status affect language or communication apprehension of ESL students?
- Does enrollment in either public speaking or reticence sections improve general English language skills of ESL students?
- Does specific instruction in second-language public speaking improve foreign language skills of native English speakers?

Presently, the university records the ESL status of individual students, along with their TOFEL scores, upon admission, but no further attention is given to ESL student achievement. International students are identified and offered ongoing services, but these efforts are available irrespective of the student's native language. In any case, based on this sample, it would seem that international ESL students are greatly outnumbered by immigrant and bicultural students who also face language issues. This survey suggests that there are sufficient numbers of students to warrant additional research into both their success in the required public speaking course and their overall university success.

Reference List

Cantu, Norma E. "My 'Excuse-me Tongue' or A Chicana in the English Classroom." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Minneapolis, April 1979.

Churchman, Edith C. "Developing a Public Speaking Course for Non-Native Speakers of English: Problems and Approaches." ED284427

DeFrietas, G. "Ethnic Differentials in Unemployment Among Hispanic Americans." *Hispanics in the U. S. Economy*. Eds. G. T. Borhas & M. Tienda. New York: Academic Press. 1985.

Dubois, Betty Lou. "Needed: EST Public Communication for Non-Native Speakers of English." *English for Specific Purposes*. 5,1 (1986):73-79.

English, Susan Lewis. "Student Lectures for Integrative Language Learning." ERIC Classroom Guides. ED227689

Frazer, Susan F. "Increasing Student Interest and Input in Advanced Language Courses." *French Review* 61, 4 (Mar 1988): 587-92.

Gallowich, Kay. "Videotaping EST/ESP Student Projects: "Real World" Research Projects for Professional and Academic Preparation." ERIC Document 374648.

Graham, Janet G. "Increasing Relevancy in a Speaking Course for Graduate Students." TESOL. Baltimore, March 1994. ED 370412.

Henderson, Don. "Speaking Activities for the Advanced College-Bound Student." TESOL. Honolulu, May 1982. ED 226583

Hesler, Marjorie W. "A Survey of the Ways American Colleges and Universities Meet the Oral Communication Needs of International Students." Speech Communication Association. San Juan. December, 1986. ED 293177.

Hines, Steven C. and Robert A. Barraclough. "Communicating in a Foreign Language: Its Effects on Perceived Motivation, Knowledge, and Communication Ability." *Communication Research Reports* 12, 2 (Fall 1995): 241-247.

Hoffman, Patrizia. "An Exploratory Study of Perceptions of Self-as-Communicator of Native and Nonnative Speakers of English in a Course for Reticent Students." Unpublished Thesis. The Pennsylvania State University. 1993.

Horwitz, Elaine K., Michael B. Horwitz and Joann Cope. "Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety." *Modern Language Journal*. 70,2 (Summer 1986): 125-32.

Johnson, Karen E. and Paula Golombek. *Public Speaking for Non-Native Speakers: A Handbook for Instructors to Accompany Lucas THE ART OF PUBLIC SPEAKING Fifth Edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1996.

Johnson, Susan M. "Public Speaking and International Career Development in the Foreign Language Business Course." Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and Literatures. Youngstown, OH. October, 1988. ED 318223.

Katchen, Johanna E. "A Public Speaking Course for EFL." TESOL. San Antonio. March, 1989.

Kearney, Patricia and Timothy G. Plax. *Public Speaking in a Diverse Society*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield. 1996.

Kelly, Lynne and Arden K. Watson. *Speaking with Confidence and Skill*. Lanham: University Press of America. 1986.

Lore-Lawson, Joye. "Self-Esteem in the Foreign Language Classroom: Activities That Do More Than Teach." ERIC Document 369267. 1993. {notes filed with Horwitz, AZ}

Lucas, Stephen E. *The Art of Public Speaking*. 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1995.

Oishi, Shinichi. "Effective Public Speaking." *Forensic Journal*, 6 (January 1984).

Powell, Robert G. and Dolores R. Avila. "Ethnicity, Communication Competency and Classroom Success: A Question of Assessment." *The Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50 (Summer 1986): 269-278.

Rudnai, Mary and Gyula Ferenczy. "Giving a Prepared Talk as a Special Goal in Teaching Medical English." 7th European Symposium on LSP, Budapest, Hungary. August, 1989.

Self, Lois Scoggins, and Carol S. Carlson-Liu. *Oral communications skills, a multicultural approach*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt. 1988.

Stokes, P. M. "Debating in the ESL Classroom." *English Language Teaching Journal* 31,1 (1976): 15-17.

Smallwood, Betty Ansin. "Public Speaking in the ESL Classroom." *TESOL Newsletter*. 10,3 (June 1976): 44. ED 187087.

Womack, Morris M. and Elinor Bernstein. *Speech for Foreign Students*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas. 1990.